

## REMARKS

In the Office Action dated November 7, 2005, the Examiner allowed Claims 1-6, but rejected Claim 7 as being anticipated by Owens, USPN 4,298,140. In response, Applicant has amended Claim 7 to more clearly distinguish the method from that of the prior art. For the following reasons, Applicant now believes all claims to be in condition for allowance.

In the Owens patent, a blade is applied to the bottom of the newspaper. It is then pushed upward from the bottom so that it may be lifted over the toe. Applicant's method, on the other hand, involves pushing a blade in a horizontal motion against the front of the newspaper or magazine. This is opposite of the Owens vertical motion. Applicant has amended Claim 7 to include this distinction as one of its limitations. Applicant believes that the Owens' method of a vertical motion where the newspaper is pushed upward from its bottom is substantially different from Applicant's method which involves pushing a blade in a vertical motion against the front of the newspaper.

For all the above reasons, Applicant now believes that the application should be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. If, for some reason, any other issues remain, a telephone conference with the Examiner is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Allen F. Bennett, Registration No. 50,199  
HEAD, JOHNSON & KACHIGIAN  
228 West 17<sup>th</sup> Place  
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74119  
(918) 587-2000  
(918) 584-1718 (facsimile)  
[abennett@hijklaw.com](mailto:abennett@hijklaw.com)  
ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT

Date: January 4, 2006